SAGRADO
Universidad del Sagrado Corazón

VICE PRESIDENCY FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

EVALUATION AND PROMOTION MANUAL

REVISED APRIL 19, 2024

UNIVERSIDAD DEL SAGRADO CORAZÓN · SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Theoretical Framework 4

II. Goals and Objectives 5

A. To promote the University’s mission through a promotion 5
B. To facilitate the professional growth of its faculty 5
C. Establish a fair evaluation system that recognizes outstanding 5

III. Procedure Applicable to Full-time Faculty 6

A. Academic Unit Promotion Committee Composition: 6
B. Institutional Rank Promotion Committee 7

IV. Definition of Academic Ranks 8

A. Instructor 9
B. Assistant Professor 9
C. Associate Professor 10
D. Full Professor 10
E. Assistant Librarian 10
F. Senior Assistant Librarian 11
G. Associate Librarian 11
H. Librarian 11

V. Requirements for Promotion in Rank 12

A. Requirements: 12
B. Categories and Evaluation Criteria: 13

VI. Sources of Information 22

VII. The Portfolio of the Candidate Must Contain the Following Documents and Supporting Evidence: 24

VIII. Regular Evaluation of All Faculty 25

A. Faculty Evaluation Instruments 26

IX. Analysis and Interpretation of Results 29

X. Amendments, Revision, and Repeal of the Manual 29

XI. Effective Date of the Manual 29

Appendix A Faculty 30

Appendix A Librarian 36
Appendix B1 42
Appendix B2 48
Appendix C1 Faculty: Student 51
Appendix C1 Librarian Student 55
Appendix C2 Faculty 62
Appendix C2 Librarian 65
Appendix D 68
Appendix E 72
Appendix F1 74
Appendix F2 77
Appendix G 79
Appendix H 84
Appendix I 88
Appendix J 89
Appendix K 90
Appendix L 91

I. Theoretical Framework

Universidad del Sagrado Corazón is a Catholic university whose members share a mission to educate individuals in intellectual freedom and moral conscience, and whose faculty and students are called to excel intellectually and morally. Through the evaluation and promotion process, the University encourages and recognizes the contributions and commitment of its faculty to the fulfillment of its mission.

By highlighting excellence, promotion in rank is a privilege, not a right. It is a privilege that faculty members earn through their merits, as well as a public recognition of those merits. Candidates for promotion must present evidence of how they have grown in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and professional development, in accordance with the requirements of the rank to which they aspire.

Sagrado recognizes certain rights of its faculty members in the promotion process; therefore, it must ensure that conditions for professional development and evaluation are in place to facilitate their efforts toward growth, including a formative evaluation process that allows them to prepare for the summative evaluation of the promotion process. Faculty members have the right to be evaluated by their peers in an environment that respects their dignity as individuals and professionals. Each year, the dean of the academic unit will refer to the Classroom Visit Committee those faculty members who must undergo at least one formative evaluation prior to the year of their eligibility for promotion in rank, as applicable. In the case of librarians, the dean will coordinate the visit with the library director, taking into account the schedule of curriculum-related workshops. The Classroom Visit Committee will recommend whether additional formative evaluation visits are necessary. The results of these evaluations will not be taken into consideration for the purposes of promotion.

Since its founding and to the present, Sagrado has been dedicated primarily to teaching, not to research. For this reason, in order for a faculty member to be promoted to any rank, they must excel in the area of teaching. While prioritizing teaching, the university also aims to fulfill the institutional goal of promoting the pursuit of knowledge, fostering richer and more innovative teaching, and attracting talented students interested in participating in research and/or .

II. Goals and Objectives

A. To promote the University's mission through a promotion

system

1. To encourage faculty members to excel intellectually and morally.
2. To achieve a participatory, personalized education that is relevant to today's social and cultural realities.
3. Ensure the humanistic, scientific, technological, and professional education of the student body, along with the corresponding skills in expression and critical thinking.
4. To serve as an agent of transformation for Puerto Rican society.
5. To carry out the promotion process in an environment that serves as a model for building a more authentically Christian Puerto Rican society: a community united in solidarity, justice, and peace.

B. To facilitate the professional growth of its faculty

1. Establish professional development programs that address both the requirements of the Mission and the professional interests and needs of the faculty.
2. Ensure that each faculty member undergoes a formative evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses that prepares them for the summative promotion evaluation, but which does not count toward the latter.
3. Develop innovative research and/or creative strategies based on the Mission and the reality of this educational institution that go beyond traditional academic research.

C. Establish a fair evaluation system that recognizes outstanding

academic work through promotion

1. Base promotion on the principle of merit.
2. Conduct the evaluation of the candidate in an atmosphere of mutual respect and in a spirit of impartiality.
3. Provide financial and/or other incentives—such as reduced teaching loads, leaves of absence, and others—to faculty members who are promoted.
4. Provide an appeals process for faculty members who are not promoted and who disagree with the decision made.

III. Procedure Applicable to Full-time Faculty

A. Academic Unit Promotion Committee Composition:

The faculty evaluation process for promotion in rank will begin in the academic units with the election, for a term of one year, of an Academic Unit Promotion Committee. The faculty of each academic unit will meet at the beginning of the academic year to elect the members of the Academic Unit Promotion Committee, which will consist of three tenured faculty members who must meet the following criteria:

a. Have been promoted in rank.
b. Be elected by an absolute majority.
c. Not be candidates for promotion during the year in which they serve on the Promotion Committee.
d. Not be a member of the Institutional Rank Promotion Committee during the same year. Duties: The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will receive the portfolios of candidates

for promotion and determine whether they contain all the necessary information for evaluation. If any portfolio is incomplete, the Committee will return it to the candidate with the relevant recommendations and a deadline for resubmission. The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will meet with the candidate, if necessary. In addition, it will complete the following forms:

a. Evaluation of the Administrative Aspects of the Teaching Position (Appendix A—Professor or Appendix A—Librarian, as applicable)
b. Summary of Classroom Visits to Evaluate Teaching Performance (Appendix B2)
c. Summary of Student Evaluations of Teaching Performance (Appendix C2—Professor or Appendix C2—Librarian, as applicable)
d. Teaching Qualification Form Regarding Requirements for Promotion in Rank (Appendix D)
e. Teaching Category Evaluation (Appendix E)
f. Evaluation of the Research Component for the Research Track (Appendix F1)
g. Evaluation of the creative component for the creative category (Appendix F2)
h. Evaluation of the Professional Development Category (Appendix H)
i. Calculation to Determine Total Percentages for Each Rank (Appendix I)
j. Summary of the Recommendation for Promotion (Appendix K) The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will meet with the candidate to

inform them of its recommendation and will forward Appendix K, along with the candidate's portfolio, to the Institutional Rank Promotion Committee. If the candidate

disagrees with the decision of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee, he or she may appeal the decision to the Institutional Promotion Committee.

B. Institutional Rank Promotion Committee

Composition:

The Institutional Rank Promotion Committee (hereinafter the Institutional Committee) shall consist of one representative from each academic unit, who must meet the following criteria:

a. Have served as a full-time faculty member at the University for at least five years.
b. Have undergone the evaluation process and been promoted in rank.
c. Be endorsed by an absolute majority of the full-time faculty of the academic unit. In years when a librarian is a candidate for promotion, a representative from the

Library, elected by a majority vote of the librarians, shall serve on the Institutional Committee. A majority is defined as 50% plus one of the votes.

Duties:

The Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs shall convene the first meeting of the Institutional Committee. At that meeting of the Institutional Committee, a chairperson shall be elected to coordinate the committee's work and convene its subsequent meetings.

The Institutional Committee will develop a work plan that must include the dates by which the promotion committees of the academic units will submit the documentation of candidates for promotion, as well as the date by which the committee must complete its work. The Institutional Committee will forward this plan to the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs, the deans of the academic units, and the Library Director, who will then communicate it to the Rank Promotion Committees of the academic units.

Each delegate from the academic unit will present to the Institutional Committee the candidates recommended by their academic unit or the Library. Once the Institutional Committee has reviewed the relevant information, it will decide whether additional information is needed. If additional information is needed, the chair of the Institutional Committee, through the academic unit's delegate, will request the required information in writing from the chair of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee, with a copy to the candidate. The chair of the Academic Unit Committee will forward it to the chair of the Institutional Committee by the stipulated date.

Once the Institutional Committee has reviewed the information pertaining to each candidate, it will complete Appendix L (Analysis of the Candidate for Promotion).

Each candidate must receive at least four out of five votes from the Institutional Committee to be promoted, or five out of six if there are candidates from the Library.

Once the Institutional Committee has made its recommendations, it will communicate them to the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs, who will submit its report to the University President. In the event that the Institutional Committee's recommendation is unfavorable regarding any candidate, the president of the Institutional Committee will notify the candidate and inform them of the opportunity to request reconsideration before an appeals committee.

The candidate may submit additional information to the appeals committee when requesting a reconsideration of his or her case. The appeals committee will be appointed by the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs, who will convene the first meeting, and will consist of a representative of the candidate, a representative of the Institutional Committee—who will chair and convene meetings—and a representative of the candidate's academic unit, elected by an absolute majority of the full-time faculty of that academic unit for this purpose. The Institutional Committee must reevaluate all documentation pertaining to the candidate in question and submit its recommendation to the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs. The Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs will evaluate each case—both those recommended by the Institutional Committee and those referred to the Appeals Committee—in consultation with the University President, who will make the final decision. The President of the Institution and the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs will contact the candidates for promotion who have been favorably recommended for promotion in rank.

IV. Definition of Academic Ranks

Academic ranks constitute a distinction for academic work in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and professional development. They represent recognition of faculty members who, through their commitment, have distinguished themselves in their academic achievements. Therefore, the conferral of academic ranks is not an automatic right acquired through seniority, but rather a distinction based on the quality of service rendered to the academic community and the University.

To be eligible for promotion in rank, the candidate must hold a tenured faculty position, which must be endorsed by the Office of Organizational Development and Human Resources. The distinction will be based on evidence of the candidates' qualifications.

Sagrado stipulates that its faculty must take full responsibility for the optimal development of the following areas:

a. Knowledge, acceptance, and implementation of the philosophy, mission, and objectives of the academic and institutional units.
b. Professional development as an educator in their discipline.
c. Involvement in processes and initiatives that serve the academic community, which form the foundation of the institution's mission, goals, and objectives.
d. Full commitment to teaching assigned courses, as well as to the rules and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

The ranks of faculty members are:

A. Instructor

The entry-level rank of Instructor signifies recognition of the faculty member as a newcomer to teaching and as possessing the academic and professional credentials that distinguish them as such. This rank is conferred upon faculty members who have completed at least a master's degree and are hired as full-time faculty.

Any instructor who earns a Ph.D. will be promoted to Assistant Professor as soon as their degree is certified. Faculty members promoted in this manner will count the current year of promotion as the first year toward their next promotion.

B. Assistant Professor

A distinguished rank that recognizes an educator's outstanding performance within their academic community, following five years as an instructor, and/or those faculty members who are conferred this rank by virtue of their doctoral degree. In both cases, these faculty members are required to fulfill the expectations of the rank, which are:

a. Develops as an educator and specialist in their discipline or profession, demonstrating effectiveness, commitment, and educational quality.
b. They demonstrate a commitment to serving the academic community and are active on committees within their academic unit and at the institutional level.
c. They participate in the development of the curriculum for their discipline.
d. They serve as a resource in presentations, forums, workshops, exhibitions, symposia, lectures, and other events relevant to their discipline and academia, including their contribution to the institution.

C. Associate Professor

A rank that distinguishes a faculty member committed to their department and discipline through research and knowledge creation. Additionally:

a. Demonstrates commitment and excellence as an educator.

b. Plays a prominent role in the university community and on committees within their academic unit and at the institutional level.

c. Encourages and participates in research, knowledge creation, and artistic expression. Demonstrates this engagement through publications, conferences, courses, creative works, programs, projects, and academic proposals.

D. Full Professor

The highest recognition of academic distinction. It signifies an exceptional track record that establishes the faculty member as an academic from a comprehensive perspective, with a greater emphasis on the dimensions of research and creation.

a. Holds a doctoral degree, its equivalent, or a solid professional background that demonstrates continuous professional development in their discipline or in those disciplines included in the university's curriculum.

b. They are an academic leader in their discipline with a proven track record as a faculty member.

c. They have extensive experience as a researcher or creator, as evidenced by publications or other recognized contributions in their discipline.

d. They demonstrate a commitment to serving academia and the university community.

e. Is a person recognized within the academic community for their intellectual leadership.

The ranks of librarians are:

E. Assistant Librarian

This rank recognizes the librarian as having begun their professional career and possessing the academic and professional credentials that distinguish them as such. The rank of Assistant Librarian is conferred upon individuals who have completed a Master's degree in Library Science or Information Science (MIS or MLS) from a college or university accredited by the American Library Association (ALA) and have less than 5 years of experience in an academic library or in the field of research.

Any Assistant Librarian who earns a doctoral degree will be promoted to Senior Assistant Librarian as soon as the degree is certified. Librarians promoted in this man-

ner will count the current year of promotion as the first year toward their next promotion.

F. Senior Assistant Librarian

This rank is conferred upon librarians who have a minimum of five years of experience as an Assistant Librarian at the Madre María Teresa Guevara Library and/or upon those librarians who are granted this rank by virtue of their doctoral degree. In both cases, these librarians are required to meet the criteria for the rank, which are:

a. Develops as a librarian and specialist in their discipline or profession, demonstrating effectiveness, commitment, and educational quality.
b. They demonstrate a commitment to serving the academic community and are active on committees within their academic unit and at the institutional level.
c. They participate in the curriculum development of their discipline.
d. They serve as a resource in presentations, forums, workshops, exhibitions, symposia, lectures, and other events relevant to their discipline and academia, including their service to the institution.

G. Associate Librarian

The rank of Associate Librarian is conferred upon librarians who have successfully performed their duties as Senior Assistant Librarian for a minimum of five years at the Madre María Teresa Guevara Library. Candidates for this rank must have demonstrated a high level of proficiency in library science skills and techniques and a high level of professional performance, with a greater emphasis on research and/or creative work. They are required to meet the criteria for the rank, which are:

a. Demonstrates commitment and excellence as a librarian.
b. Play a prominent role in university community initiatives and in committees within your academic unit and at the institutional level.
c. Encourages and participates in research, knowledge creation, and artistic expression. Demonstrates this through publications, conferences, courses, creative works, programs, projects, and academic proposals.

H. Librarian

This is the highest professional rank and is reserved for librarians who have made significant contributions to the profession and the university community over a five-year period as an Associate Librarian. Additionally, it positions the librarian as a fac-

ulty member from a holistic perspective, with a greater emphasis on the research and/or creative dimensions of the role.

a. They demonstrate solid and continuous professional development in their discipline.
b. The librarian is an academic leader in their discipline and serves on the faculty senate.
c. Possesses extensive experience as a researcher or creator, as evidenced by publications or other recognized contributions in their discipline.
d. Demonstrates a commitment to serving academia and the university community.
e. Is a person recognized within the academic community for their intellectual leadership.

V. Requirements for Promotion in Rank

The evaluation process for full-time faculty seeking promotion in rank will be divided into two phases: meeting the requirements and meeting the evaluation criteria for the four established categories or dimensions.

A. Requirements:

The candidate must meet the following requirements:

a. Hold a master's degree or an equivalent degree recognized by Sagrado.
b. Have served as a full-time faculty member at Sagrado for five consecutive years in a given rank before advancing to the next rank. If a faculty member completes their doctoral studies while holding the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor, they may undergo the evaluation process for promotion after four years, rather than five. Approved unpaid leaves of absence for studies, exchange programs, and academic research will be counted toward years of service for all ranks.
c. Fulfill the following teaching responsibilities:

- Teach classes with the regularity required by the format of each course or, in the case of librarians, conduct workshops with the required regularity.
- Be available to students during office hours or by appointment, or, in the case of librarians, provide reference services (in person and/or online).
- Regularly attend faculty meetings for their academic unit.
- Regularly attend University faculty meetings.
- Submit the course evaluation, the attendance roster for the first two weeks, and the grades (midterms and finals; does not apply to librarians).

- Participate in or contribute to initiatives related to academic quality, innovation, and/or retention within your program or academic unit.
- Participate in or collaborate with institutional committees or working groups (for example: Academic Board, Administrative Board, Grievances Committee, among others). Demonstrate mastery of the content discussed in class or in a workshop.
- Communicate clearly with students.
- Outline the objectives or purposes of the class or workshop.
- Facilitate the classes or workshops with an organized structure (for example, introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and conclusion).
- Use appropriate teaching strategies to meet the objectives of the class or workshop.
- Promote active learning.
- Encourage critical thinking and creativity.
- Provide examples that facilitate understanding of the content discussed.
- Provide opportunities to clarify questions.
- Treat students with respect. Promote inclusion and diversity.
- Handle any challenges that may arise in the courses with professionalism.

Appendix D (Faculty Qualification Form on Requirements for Promotion) documents compliance or non-compliance with these teaching responsibilities. To be eligible for promotion, you must achieve an overall average of two or higher on this Appendix. If not, the process is halted.

In cases of exceptional merit, and upon the recommendation of the Vice- Presidency for Academic Affairs, the University President may, on an extraordinary basis, evaluate the time required for promotion or the recognition of a higher rank.

B. Categories and Evaluation Criteria:

Once the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee determines that the candidate meets the requirements, it will proceed to evaluate the candidate's work in four basic categories: (1) teaching or library work, (2) research and/or creative work, (3) service, and (4) professional development. The relative weightings of each category will vary for each rank, according to the following tables:

Professor

Librarian

Teaching

The teaching category refers to the work performed by the professor to facilitate the teaching-learning process in the classroom. This process is characterized primarily by the personal interaction between professor and student, the active participation of students, and the social and cultural relevance of the course content.

The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will take into account the criteria listed below when evaluating the teaching category. Next to each criterion, the appendix or appendices where it is evaluated are listed (see the Appendices section). Criteria: a) Participate in or contribute to institutional committees or working groups (e.g., Academic Board, Administrative Board, Complaints and Grievances Committee, among others). (Appendix A—Faculty) b) Participate in or contribute to initiatives related to academic quality, innovation, and/or retention within your program or academic unit. (Appendix A—Faculty) c) Submit the course evaluation, the enrollment roster for the first two weeks, and grades (midterms and finals) on time. (Appendix A —Faculty) d) Attend university faculty meetings regularly. (Appendix A—Faculty) e) Regularly attend faculty meetings for their academic unit. (Appendix A— Faculty) f) Be available to students during office hours or by appointment (in person and/or online). (Appendix A—Faculty) g) Teach classes with the regularity required by the format of each course. (Appendix A—Faculty) h) Demonstrate mastery of the content discussed in class. (Appendix B2) i) Communicate clearly during classes. (Appendix B2) j) Outline the objectives or purposes of the class. (Appendix B2) k) Facilitate the class with a well-organized organized

(forexample: introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and conclusion). (Appendix B2) l) Use appropriate teaching strategies to meet the class objectives. (Appendix B2) m) Promote active learning. (Appendix B2) n) Promote critical thinking and creativity. (Appendix B2) o) Provide examples that facilitate understanding of the content discussed. (Appendix B2)

a. Demonstrate mastery of the content. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
b. Encourage student participation. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
c. Promote critical thinking and creativity. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
d. Provide examples that facilitate understanding of the content presented in class. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
e. Provide opportunities to clarify questions. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
f. Treat students with respect. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
g. Promote inclusion and diversity. (Appendix C2—Faculty)
h. Handle any challenges that may arise during the course with professionalism. (Appendix C2—Faculty) The recommendation of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee must

be included in Appendices D (Teaching Qualification Form on Requirements for Promotion), E (Evaluation for the Teaching Category), and K (Summary of the Recommendation for Promotion, Teaching Section).

Library Work

The library work category refers to the activities and tasks performed by the librarian to strengthen the development of information literacy skills linked to the curriculum. This responsibility is characterized by in-person or virtual interactions between the librarian and students, the co-curricular relevance of their workshops, and the development of the collections.

The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will take into account the criteria listed below when evaluating the library work category. Next to each criterion, the appendix or appendices where it is evaluated are indicated (see the Appendices section).

Criteria:

a. Provides effective mechanisms for developing information literacy skills by offering workshops linked to the academic curriculum. (Appendix A—Librarians)

b) Applies new technologies and strategies that promote the use of library resources and services within the academic community. (Appendix A— Librarians) c) Effectively addresses information and research inquiries from the entire academic community during service hours. (Appendix A—Librarians) d) Regularly attends faculty meetings for their academic unit. (Appendix A—Librarians) e) Regularly attends university senate meetings. (Appendix A—Librarians) f) Prepares and submits annual reports and other work for the academic unit on time. (Appendix A—Librarians) g) Actively participates in projects and initiatives related to collection development and its integration into the curriculum by reviewing course catalogs and/or curriculum matrices within the required timeframe. (Appendix A—Librarians) h) Fulfill commitments made when coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects. (Appendix A—Librarians) i) Participates in the development of co-curricular activities (community engagement, volunteer work, the Center for Professional and International Experiences, the Library, the Language Lab, Neeuko, Academic Advising, or other institutional activities or projects). (Appendix A—Librarians) j) Demonstrates mastery of course-related content through a workshop. (Appendix B2) k) Communicates clearly during the workshops. (Appendix B2) l) Outlines the objectives or purposes of the workshop. (Appendix B2) m) Facilitate the workshop with an organized structure (e.g., introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and conclusion). (Appendix B2) n) Uses appropriate teaching strategies to meet the workshop's objectives.

(Appendix B2) o) Promote active learning. (Appendix B2) p) Promote critical thinking and creativity. (Appendix B2) q)

Provide examples that facilitate understanding of the content discussed.

(Appendix B2) r) Demonstrate mastery of the content. (Appendix C2—Librarians) s) Encourages participation from workshop attendees. (Appendix C2—

Librarians) t) It promotes critical thinking and creativity among workshop participants

by encouraging activities or tasks designed to prompt reflection,

analysis, interpretation, or argumentation. (Appendix C2—Librarians) u) Provides examples that help participants understand the content

presented. (Appendix C2—Librarians) v) Provides an opportunity to clarify questions. (Appendix C2—Librarians) w) Treats participants with respect. For example, by choosing words

carefully, being punctual, communicating respectfully (both verbally

and in writing), and consistently following through on workshop tasks

and activities, among other things. (Appendix C2—Librarians) x) Demonstrate and promote inclusion and diversity. For example, use

inclusive language and diverse materials and readings. (Appendix C2—

Librarians) y) Handle any challenges (technological, behavioral, communication-

related, etc.) that may arise during the workshop with professionalism.

For example: connectivity issues, participants in crisis, or participants

exhibiting behavioral problems in the classroom. (Appendix C2—

Librarians) The recommendation of the Academic Unit’s Rank Promotion Committee must be included in Appendices D (Teaching Qualification Form on Requirements for Promotion in Rank), E (Evaluation for the Teaching Category), and K (Summary of the Recommendation for Promotion in Rank, Teaching Section).

Process for Calculating the Percentage Obtained for Promotion in Rank (Appendix E):

To calculate the percentage obtained for promotion in rank, follow these steps:

a. First, calculate the percentage for each of the evaluations: the administrative evaluation (Appendix A), the peer evaluation (Appendix B2), and the student evaluation (Appendix C2). To do this, add up the scores obtained for all criteria that have points assigned. Then, divide that total by the maximum achievable

score for the evaluation in question. The result will be a decimal number that you will multiply by 100. Repeat this step for each of the three evaluations.

b. Next, in Appendix E, apply the weight assigned to each evaluation, which is as follows: administrative evaluation .30 (Appendix A), peer evaluation .35 (Appendix B2), and student evaluation .35 (Appendix C2). To do this, multiply the percentage obtained for the evaluation by .30 or .35, depending on the evaluation being calculated. The result of this multiplication will be a whole number with a decimal, which is the weighted percentage for that evaluation. Repeat this step for each of the three evaluations, applying the corresponding weight in the multiplication. Next, record the weighted percentage obtained for each evaluation in the

c. respective boxes: administrative evaluation (Appendix A), peer evaluation (Appendix B2), and student evaluation (Appendix C2).

d. Add the three weighted percentages together. The result of this sum will be the total percentage obtained by the professor in their evaluation for promotion in rank within the teaching category.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Results for the Teaching Category:

To determine whether the candidate for promotion in rank meets the requirements of this category, the following process will be followed:

a. The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee must complete Appendix A with the information provided by the candidate and by the director of the academic unit.

b. The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee must complete Appendix B2. To do so, the scores obtained in two of the Appendix B1 forms are added together, and the result is divided by two.

c. The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee must complete Appendix C2. To do so, it will calculate the average for each item in the three Appendices C1 submitted by the candidate for promotion.

d. The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee shall complete Appendix E based on Appendices A, B2, and C2. To do so, the three weighted percentages obtained from these appendices are added together to obtain the overall percentage.

e. The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will complete the teaching section of Appendices K and I. Research and/or Creative Work Research: The term "research" is defined as the activity that generates, confirms or

invalidates, modifies, or applies knowledge for the purpose of understanding aspects of reality from the perspective of one or more disciplines. To this end, a rigorous

methodology is employed, which may be quantitative, qualitative, and/or mixed in nature.

The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will take the following criteria into account when evaluating the research component of the research and/or creative work category:

a. Criteria related to the development of research projects (70%):

- Does not meet requirements—Did not provide evidence of having conducted any research project.
- Partial compliance (1) – Option #1: Submitted evidence of having prepared a research proposal, but no evidence of having implemented and completed the research. Option #2: Collected data, but did not submit evidence of having analyzed it.
- Expected Compliance (2) – Option #1: Submitted evidence of having conducted a small-scale research project or submitted evidence of having prepared two small-scale research proposals and of having completed at least one (1) of the research projects. Option #2: Submitted evidence of having one (1) large-scale research project currently in progress.
- Distinctive Compliance (3) - Alternative #1: Provided evidence that they conducted two (2) small-scale research projects. Alternative #2: Provided evidence that they conducted at least one (1) large-scale research project.

b) Criteria regarding the dissemination of research project results (30%):

- Non-compliant (0) - Did not provide evidence that the results of the research project were disseminated.
- Partial compliance (1) - Provided evidence that they disseminated the results of the research project by providing copies of the research to a library.
- Expected compliance (2) - Option #1: Provided evidence of disseminating the results of the research project by providing copies to a library and giving a presentation at their academic unit. Option #2: Provided evidence of disseminating the results of the research project by providing copies of the research to a library, delivering a lecture, and publishing an article or review in newspapers or other print or electronic publications.
- Distinctive Compliance (3) - Provided evidence that they disseminated the results of the research project by providing copies of the research to a library, delivering a lecture, and publishing an article in a peer-reviewed professional journal, in a book, in a widely circulated newspaper, or via electronic media.

a. Sources of Information For the research component of the research and/or creation category, the Academic

Unit's Promotion Committee must use the following forms and any other documentation that substantiates these achievements:

- Self-Evaluation Summary (Appendix J)
- Evaluation of the Research Component of the Research and/or Creation Category (Appendix F1)

The recommendation of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee must be recorded in Appendix K, under the research and/or creation section.

a. Analysis and Interpretation of Results To determine the candidate's eligibility for promotion, the following

process will be followed:

- The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will complete Appendix F1 based on Appendix J and other documents submitted by the faculty member under evaluation, such as copies of the research project, articles, and any other evidence deemed necessary.
- To calculate the weighted percentage for research and outreach: i. For the research category, divide the score obtained by three (3). Then multiply the result by 100. Finally, multiply the new result by .70. ii. For the outreach category, divide the score by three (3). Then multiply the result by 100. Finally, multiply the new result by .30. iii. Finally, add the two weighted percentages together. The result of this sum will be the total percentage obtained by the faculty member in their evaluation for promotion in the research and/or creative work category. The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will complete the
- research and/or creative work section of Appendix I and Appendix K.

Creation:

The term "creativity" is defined as the generation of a product of the imagination in any medium (video, multimedia, literature, visual arts, music, and/or theater) that involves research and that contributes to teaching, human understanding, and reflection.

a. Criteria related to the development of creative projects (70%): Does not meet requirements (0) – Did not provide evidence

- of having carried out any creative project.
- Partial compliance (1) – Provided evidence of having developed a proposal for a creative project. Expected fulfillment (2) – Provided evidence of a creative project
- currently in progress.

- Outstanding Compliance (3) – Provided evidence of having completed at least one creative project.

a. Criteria related to the dissemination of the creative project (30%):

- Did not meet requirements (0) - Did not provide evidence of having publicized the creative project.
- Partial fulfillment (1) - Provided evidence that they publicized the creative project to the university community. Expected Compliance (2) - Provided evidence that they shared the
- creative project to a local in-person and/or virtual audience. Outstanding compliance (3) - Provided evidence of having
- disseminated the creative project to an international audience, either in person and/or virtually.

a. Sources of information: For the creation component of the research and/or creation category, the Academic

Unit's Promotion Committee must use the following forms and any other documentation that demonstrates these achievements:

- Self-Evaluation Summary (Appendix J)
- Evaluation of the creation component for the research and/or creation category (Appendix F2)
- The recommendation of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee must be included in Appendix K, under the research and/or creation section.

a. Analysis and interpretation of the results: To determine a candidate's eligibility for promotion in rank, the following

process will be followed:

- The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will complete Appendix F2 based on Appendix J and other documents submitted by the faculty member under evaluation, such as copies of the creative project and any evidence deemed necessary.

i. To calculate the weighted percentage for research and dissemination:

1. For the creation category, divide the score obtained by three (3). Then multiply the result by 100. Finally, multiply the new result by .70.
2. For the dissemination category, divide the score obtained by three (3). Then multiply the result by 100. Finally, multiply the new result by .30.

3. Finally, add the two weighted percentages together. The result of this sum will be the total percentage obtained by the faculty member in their evaluation for promotion in the research and/or creation category.

- The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will complete the research and/or creative work section of Appendix I and Appendix K.

Service

The service category refers to the faculty member's participation in co- curricular and extracurricular activities related to their academic unit, the University, and the community. The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will consider the following criteria when evaluating the service category:

Criteria:

a. Actively participate in committees within the academic unit.
b. Actively participate in institutional committees.
c. Participate in and/or be available for the organization, development, and implementation of activities and projects within the academic unit, at the institutional level, and in the external community.
d. Carry out service activities for their academic unit, such as coordinating academic areas or programs, courses, providing academic advising to students and/or student associations, and conducting classroom evaluation visits of faculty members, among others.
e. Participate in professional activities within or outside their field of specialization and/or assist in organizing them. Sources of Information: For the service category, the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee must

use the following forms and any other documentation that demonstrates these achievements:

a. Self-Evaluation Summary (Appendix J)
b. Service Category Evaluation (Appendix G) Analysis and interpretation of the results of the service criterion: To determine the candidate's eligibility for promotion, the following

process will be followed:

The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will complete the service section of the Calculation Sheet to obtain the total percentages for each rank (Appendix I) and the Summary Sheet for the Recommendation for Rank Promotion (Appendix K).

Professional Development

The professional development category refers to the faculty member's participation in activities aimed at updating their academic and professional knowledge. The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will consider the following criteria when evaluating this category:

Criteria:

a. Participation in professional associations within or outside their field of specialization.
b. Participation in academic academic, such as: forums, conferences, lectures, and/or workshops.
c. Earning academic degrees, completing formal courses or continuing education courses, or obtaining certificates.
d. Participation as a resource in professional activities. Sources of information: For the professional development category, the Academic Unit's Promotion

Committee must use Appendix J and any other documentation that substantiates these achievements.

Analysis and interpretation of results in the professional

development category:

To determine the candidate's eligibility for promotion, the following process will be followed:

The Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee will complete the Appendix H and the professional development section of Appendices I and K.

VI. Sources of Information

The evaluation of faculty for promotion will be based on four sources of information: (1) the faculty, (2) the student body, (3) the director of the academic unit, and (4) the faculty member being evaluated.

The first source of information for the evaluation of the candidate is the Classroom Visit Committee, composed of faculty members and/or academic leaders from the respective academic units. This Committee will visit classes to observe teaching performance during both formative and summative assessment processes. To document the results of both processes, the Committee will complete Appendix B1.

For each peer evaluation, the dean will establish a Classroom Observation Committee. This committee will consist of the dean, the academic leader, or the person delegated to represent them, and a faculty member selected by the candidate being evaluated. The selection of this second member is optional on the part of the faculty mem-

ber being evaluated, and the selected faculty member must specialize in the academic area of the course and/or have experience in the subject matter. The Classroom Observation Committee will conclude its duties once the process of discussing the evaluation with the faculty member being evaluated is complete.

The dean will announce the classroom visit two weeks in advance via an official communication. “Classroom” refers to both in-person and virtual settings, including recorded sessions. The faculty member being evaluated will be informed of how the evaluation will be conducted and who will be part of the Classroom Observation Committee. In addition, the faculty member will be instructed that, following the visit, they must provide the following documentation within 48 hours: the presentation or material discussed in the observed class, any worksheets or exercises used, and the course syllabus or curriculum outline.

For their part, students will evaluate aspects closely related to the presentation and conduct of the course. Student evaluations will be used to determine whether the candidate meets the requirements for promotion and to assess the effectiveness of the professor’s or librarian’s work. In particular, students will evaluate classroom management, the organization of course materials, the methods used by the professor or librarian to assess student performance, and the respect shown toward students. In cases where the professor or librarian is not participating in the promotion process at the time of evaluation, they are expected to meet the minimum standard for each of the criteria assessed in the evaluation instrument.

For the evaluation of the teaching or library work category in the promotion process, the results of the Classroom Visit Committee’s observations (Appendix B2) will be combined with student evaluations (Appendix C2); both evaluations will carry equal weight, totaling 70%. The administrative aspects of teaching (Appendix A) will account for 30%.

The Academic Unit’s Rank Promotion Committee will evaluate the requirements for rank promotion (Appendix D) using the information obtained from Appendices A, B2, and C2, which must also be completed.

Based on the information provided by the professor or librarian and by the director of the academic unit, the Committee will determine whether the candidate meets the administrative requirements for teaching or library work. The dean or director of the academic unit will evaluate the candidate’s contribution to co- curricular and extracurricular activities of the academic unit, the University, and the community (Appendix G).

The candidate will undergo a continuous self-evaluation, which will take the form of a report submitted at the end of each academic year. In this document, the candidate will provide an account of their performance in the four areas considered for evaluation: teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and professional develop-

ment. Along with their report, the candidate will submit the necessary evidence to document their professional activities during the evaluation period. This information will be included in Appendix J.

In the event that a candidate has completed forms that belong to the Evaluation and Promotion Manual approved in 2017, the candidate may request that the Academic Unit's Evaluation and Promotion Committee apply a remedy so that all forms use the same 3-point scale as the forms in the current manual (2022). This adjustment will consist of an equivalence of the score obtained on the 5-point scale (2017) and will be processed by the VPAA.

VII. The Portfolio of the Candidate Must Contain the Following Documents and Supporting Evidence:

a. Resume

b. A comprehensive self-assessment summary of the candidate's significant achievements over the past five years in the four key areas evaluated for promotion:

- Teaching or library work
- Research and/or creative work
- Service
- Professional development

a. This self-evaluation summary must reflect the major achievements documented in the candidate's record and annual reports. To this end, Appendix J must be completed.

b. List of new courses created and list of courses revised individually or as part of a team during the evaluation period.

c. List of courses in which you have incorporated methodologies such as: distance learning, community engagement, language skills development, among others.

d. Copies of your articles, reviews, or published works mentioned in your resume, as well as copies of videos, compositions, or photographs of your artistic work or exhibitions, if applicable.

e. Copies of research or creative proposals, whether in progress or completed.

f. Copies of research or creative projects, whether in progress or completed.

g. Evidence of your participation as a speaker at conferences, forums, workshops, conferences, and other events.

h. Copies of letters and expressions of recognition or appreciation for your participation in academic, administrative, professional, and service activities

i. Evidence (such as copies of certificates, etc.) of your participation in professional development activities both within and outside the institution.

j. Three student evaluations of teaching performance (Appendix C1) corresponding to the evaluation period.

k. Evidence of participation in committees within your academic unit and/or at the institutional level, including the years of participation.

l. Evidence of your participation in other tasks within your academic unit and at the institutional level, along with the years in which you participated.

m. Evidence of your participation in organizing professional activities in your field of specialization.

n. Evidence of participation in the organization of extracurricular activities.

o. Evidence of your participation in activities and projects within your academic unit, at the institutional level, and in the external community.

p. Evidence of any other activities you consider relevant to your evaluation.

VIII. Regular Evaluation of All Faculty

The primary objective of the faculty evaluation process is the professional development of faculty members in all areas of academic performance. Full-time faculty will be evaluated by peers in a course within their area of specialization once a year. This will occur regardless of whether or not they are candidates for promotion.

On the other hand, newly hired faculty members—whether full-time or part- time—will be evaluated by their peers in a course in their area of specialization during the second semester or term in which they begin their duties at Sagrado. The evaluation submitted by the students will support the professional development of newly hired faculty members during the first semester or term. If the dean of the academic unit decides to recommend an evaluation by the Classroom Visit Committee during the evaluated faculty member's first semester or term, it will be used for the faculty member's professional development. Part-time faculty will be evaluated once a year or whenever their dean so recommends.

For each peer evaluation, the dean will appoint a Classroom Observation Committee. This committee will consist of the dean or academic leader—or the person the dean delegates to act on their behalf—and a faculty member selected by the faculty member being evaluated. The selection of this second member is optional on the part of the professor being evaluated, and the selected faculty member must specialize in the academic area of the course and/or have experience in the subject matter. The Classroom Visit Committee will conclude its duties once the process of discussing the evaluation with the professor being evaluated is complete.

The dean will announce the classroom visit two weeks in advance via an official communication. “Classroom” refers to both in-person and virtual settings, including recorded sessions. The faculty member being evaluated will be informed of how the evaluation will be conducted and who will be part of the Classroom Visit Committee. In addition, they will be instructed that, following the visit, they must provide the following documentation within 48 hours: the presentation or material discussed in the visited class, any worksheets or exercises used, and the course syllabus or curriculum outline.

The Classroom Visit Committee must discuss and complete Appendix B2 collectively. Subsequently, the dean, or the person delegated by the dean, will discuss the results with the faculty member being evaluated. Appendix B2 must document the faculty member’s comments, as well as any corrective actions to be taken, if applicable. At the end of each semester or term, the dean must submit a report to the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs summarizing the evaluation process for their faculty.

Furthermore, all faculty members, regardless of whether they are part-time or full-time, will be evaluated by students each term in which they teach courses. Once the faculty member receives the results of the If a faculty member receives student evaluations of their teaching, they will have the option to discuss the results with the dean within 30 calendar days. The dean will have five (5) calendar days to respond to the faculty member. The faculty member may also submit to the dean evidence, an explanatory letter, or any other material they believe should accompany their student evaluation. If, after the meeting with the dean, the faculty member still disagrees with the outcome, they must request a meeting with the VPAA. The VPAA’s decision will be final.

A. Faculty Evaluation Instruments

The Academic Unit’s Promotion Committee will use the instruments briefly described below—which are included as appendices to this Manual—to evaluate the performance of candidates.

Appendix A—Faculty and Appendix A—Librarian: Evaluation of the

Administrative Aspects of the Teaching Category

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the administrative aspects of the teaching category. It will be completed by the Academic Unit’s Promotion Committee using information provided by the candidate and the dean of the academic unit.

Appendix B1: Classroom Observation Form for Evaluating Teaching or

Librarian Performance

The purpose of this form is to evaluate teaching or library work in the classroom. It will be completed separately by the members of the Classroom Observation Committee. Then, after discussing their respective evaluations, they will fill out this form together, averaging the scores for each criterion and summarizing the comments. This final form will be the one discussed with the person being evaluated. This instrument will also be used to evaluate candidates from academic units for promotion in rank within the teaching category.

Appendix B2: Summary of Classroom Visits to Evaluate Teaching Performance

The purpose of this form is to evaluate teaching or library work in the classroom. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee, , which must calculate the average for each item from two classroom visit forms (Appendix B1) for the faculty member or librarian being evaluated and copy them into this appendix. The faculty member or librarian being evaluated will select the two forms to present to the Committee, if there are more than two.

Appendix C1-Instructor and Appendix C1-Librarian: Student Evaluation of

Teaching Performance

The purpose of this form is to gather student feedback on the professor's or librarian's performance in the classroom. It will be completed by students in the sections where it is administered. The averages from three student evaluation forms will be used for faculty evaluation for promotion.

Appendix C2—Instructor and C2—Librarian: Summary of Student

Evaluations of Teaching Performance

The purpose of this form is to gather student feedback on the performance of the professor or librarian in the classroom. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee, which must calculate the average for each item from the three student evaluations submitted to the Committee by the professor and copy them onto this form.

Appendix D: Faculty Qualification Form for Promotion Requirements

The purpose of this form is to determine whether the professor or librarian qualifies as a candidate for promotion. To qualify, the professor or librarian must achieve an overall average of two or more "Meets Expectations" on this form. If so, they will proceed to the evaluation phase for promotion. This form will be completed by the members of the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee based on the information obtained in Appendices A, B2, and C2.

Appendix E: Evaluation of the Teaching Category

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance in the teaching category. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee based on the percentages obtained in Appendices A, B2, and C2.

Appendix F1: Evaluation of the Research Component for the research and/or creative category

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion in the research component of the research and/or creative work category. It shall be completed by the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee based on the evidence and other documents submitted by the faculty member or librarian being evaluated, such as copies of the research project, articles, and any other evidence deemed necessary.

Appendix F2: Evaluation of the Creative Work Component for the Research and/or Creative Work Category

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion in the creative component of the research and/or creative category. It shall be completed by the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee based on Appendix J and other documents submitted by the faculty member or librarian under evaluation, such as copies of the creative project and any evidence deemed necessary.

Appendix G: Evaluation of the Service Category

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the performance of the candidate for promotion in the service category. It shall be completed by the dean of the academic unit based on the information contained in Appendix J and other relevant documents contained in the file and/or portfolio of the faculty member or librarian being evaluated.

Appendix H: Evaluation of the Professional Development Category

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion in rank within the professional development category. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee based on the information contained in Appendix J and other relevant documents contained in the portfolio of the faculty member or librarian being evaluated.

Appendix I: Calculation of Total Percentages for Each Rank

The purpose of this sheet is to compile the total percentages obtained by the candidate in each category according to the relative weights established for each category based on the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. It shall be completed by the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee based on the totals obtained in Appendices E, F1 and/or F2, G, and H.

Appendix J: Self-Assessment Summary

This form will be completed by the candidate for promotion, using the information presented in their annual reports, which must be supported by the corresponding documentation and included in their portfolio.

Appendix K: Summary of the Recommendation for Promotion

This form shall be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee using the information obtained from Appendices E, F1, and/or F2, G, H, and I.

Appendix L: Analysis of the Candidate for Promotion

This form shall be completed by the Institutional Promotion Committee using the information contained in Appendix K and any other documentation from the candidate's portfolio that it deems necessary.

IX. Analysis and Interpretation of Results

a. To be promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor or Senior Associate Librarian, the candidate must obtain a minimum of 75% of the weighted score.
b. To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian, the candidate must obtain 80% of the weighted score.
c. To be promoted to the rank of Professor or Librarian, the candidate must obtain a minimum of 90% of the weighted score.
d. Refer to Appendix I for the criteria for achieving these percentages.
e. If the candidate achieves the percentage corresponding to the rank he or she is aiming for, he or she will be promoted to that rank.

X. Amendments, Revision, and Repeal of the Manual

The need to revise this Manual will be evaluated by the Vice-Presidency for Academic Affairs and the academic community no later than five (5) years from the date of adoption or whenever required by changes in institutional, state, or federal policies or regulations. This Manual supersedes all prior regulations, policies, and/or certifications and/or guidelines that conflict with the provisions herein.

XI. Effective Date of the Manual

This Manual shall take effect immediately upon approval by the Academic Board on April 19, 2024.

APPENDIX A

Faculty

Evaluation of Administrative Aspects of the Teaching Category

Instructions: Carefully read each statement and, using the rubric provided with this appendix, select the option that best represents your response using the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the total percentage.

Note: Statements enclosed in a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to “Expected Compliance” (2 points) for that statement.

Name of the professor:	
Promotion Evaluation Committee of the Academic Unit to which the faculty member belongs:	
Academic Director:	
Date of evaluation:	

Criterion | The professor...	Compliance Level 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1. Taught classes with the regularity required by the format of each course.					
2. Was available to students during office hours or by appointment.					
3. Regularly attended faculty meetings in their academic unit.					
4. Regularly attended university faculty meetings.					

Criterion | The professor...	Compliance Level 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
5. Submitted the course evaluation, the enrollment roster for the first two weeks, and grades (midterms and finals) on time.					

Premise | The professor...	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
6. Created, reviewed, and/or updated the curriculum, courses, and/or syllabi by the dates specified by the dean or director.					
7. Fulfilled the commitments made upon accepting teaching load reductions, leaves of absence, and coordinated and/or evaluated proposals and other institutional projects.					
8. Participated in the development of co-curricular activities (Community Engagement, Volunteering, Center for Professional and International Experiences, Library, Language Lab, Neeuko, Academic Advising, or other institutional activities or projects).					
Maximum achievable score	19				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Comments:

Signature of the dean or his/her representative Date	
Signature of the evaluated professor Date	

Instructions: Use the following rubric to complete Appendix A of the Evaluation and Promotion Manual .

Premise | The professor	Outstanding Performance 3	Expected Performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
1. Taught classes with the regularity required by the format of each course.		• 95–100% of the time, they taught the sessions for each course they taught in the corresponding format. • 95–100% of the time, the professor notified their supervisor and students in advance of any absences. • 95–100% of the time, they made up the material from the day they were absent.	• Taught the majority (80–94%) of the sessions for each course they taught in the corresponding format. • Most of the time (80–94%), they notified their supervisor and students in advance of any absences. • Most of the time (80–94%), they made up the material from the day on which they were absent.	• On a few occasions (79% or less) did they teach the sessions for each course they taught in the corresponding format. • Rarely (79% or less) did they notify their supervisor and students when they were absent. • Rarely (79% or less) did the professor make up the material from the day they were absent?	
2. They were available to their students during office hours or by appointment.		Between 95–100% of the time, they were available to their students during their	Between 80–94% of the time, he was available to his students during their	Rarely (79% or less) was available to his or her students during their	

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
		• during office hours or by appointment. • Between 95–100% of the time, they provided the schedule or instructions for appointments starting on the first day of class. • Between 95–100% of the time, they indicated from the start of the course how students could contact them.	• During office hours or by appointment. • Between 80–94% of the time, they provided the schedule or instructions for appointments at some point during the first two weeks of the course. • Between 80–94% of the time, they indicated at some point during the first two weeks of the course how students could contact him.	• office hours or by appointment. • Rarely (79% or less) provided details on the schedule or instructions for scheduling appointments . • Rarely (79% or less) indicated how they could be contacted.	
3. Regularly attended faculty meetings in their academic unit.		• 1He attended meetings 90–100% of the time. • In the event of an absence, they notified their supervisor 90–100% of the time.	• Between 80–89% of the time. • When absent, they notified their supervisor 80–89% with their	• 79% or fewer of the time, they did not attend the meetings. • 79% or fewer of the time, they did not give their supervisor.	

1 To earn the maximum score on criteria #3 and #4, the faculty member must have attended between 90% and 100% of the meetings convened by the President, the VPAA, or the dean of the academic unit, as provided in the Faculty Handbook. Excused absences will count as attendance up to 25% of the total number of meetings, except in exceptional cases in which the committee will use its best judgment.

Prerequisite | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
			supervisor.		

Prerequisite | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
4. Attended university faculty meetings regularly.		• Attended university faculty meetings 90– 100% of the time. • In the event of an absence, 90–100% of the time, they provided an excuse to their supervisor.	∉ They attended faculty meetings 80–89% of the time. ∉ When absent, 80–89% of the time he or she notified his or her supervisor.	• Did not attend the meetings. • Did not notify their supervisor of their absence.	
5. Submitted the course evaluation, the attendance roster for the first two weeks, and the grades (midterms and finals) on time.		95–100% of the time, he submitted the appraisal (when required), the attendance roster, and the grades on time.	80–94% of the time, the student submitted the assessment (when required), the attendance record, and the grades on time.	• Did not submit them on time. • Did not provide an excuse to their supervisor.	
6. Created, reviewed, and/or updated the curriculum, courses, and/or course syllabi by the dates specified by the dean.	Created, reviewed, or updated at least two (2) courses (including course materials and setup in the LMS), or updated to the curriculum.	Created, reviewed, or updated at least one (1) course (including course materials and LMS setup), or updated the curriculum.	Reviewed or updated at least one (1) course (including course handbooks).	Did not participate in or contribute to the creation, revision, or update of courses (review of course outlines, LMS setup, and/or curriculum).	
7. Fulfilled the commitments made upon acceptance	Exceeded (more than 100%) the	Met (95–100%) the objectives	Met (85–94%) of some of the objectives	Did not meet the set objectives	Did not make commitments, did not delegate, nor

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
discharged duties, issued licenses, coordinated, and/or evaluated proposals and other institutional projects.	Work objectives undertaken upon accepting the responsibility to process, issue licenses, coordinate, and/or evaluate proposals and other institutional projects.	set forth upon accepting to handle, license, coordinate, or evaluate proposals and other institutional projects.	set forth upon accepting to download, license, coordinate, or evaluate proposals and other institutional projects.	Accepting, licensing, coordinating, or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects.	licenses and did not coordinate or evaluate proposals or other instructional projects.
8.Participated in the development of co-curricular activities (Community Engagement, Volunteering, Center for Professional and International Experiences, Library, Language Lab, Neeuko, Academic Advising, or other institutional activities or projects).	Participated in at least one (1) co-curricular initiative over the course of two (2) academic terms and served as a resource on at least one occasion for a co-curricular project (including participating as a guest resource to give a talk, provide training, or deliver a lecture; developing content; or serving on any	Included at least one (1) co- curricular initiative in two (2)courses but did not serve as a resource.	Included at least one (1) co-curricular initiative in one (1)course, but did not serve as a resource.	Did not participate in the development of co-curricular activities.	

Premise | The professor	Outstanding Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
	Activity (co-curricular, among others).				
Maximum achievable score	19				

APPENDIX A

Librarian

Evaluation of the Administrative Aspects of the Teaching Category

> **Instructions:** Carefully read each statement and, using the rubric provided with this appendix, select the option that best represents your response using the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used for this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the total percentage.

Note: Statements enclosed in a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to “Expected Compliance” (2 points) for that statement.

Name of the professor:	
Promotion Evaluation Committee of the Academic Unit to which the faculty member belongs:	
Academic Director:	
Date of evaluation:	

Premise | The professor...	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1. Provides effective mechanisms for developing information literacy skills by offering workshops linked to the academic curriculum.					
2.Implemented new technologies and strategies that promote the use of library resources and services within the .					

Premise | The professor...	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
3.Effectively addresses information and research inquiries from the entire					
academic community during its hours of operation.					
Premise | The professor...	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
4. Attended faculty meetings for their academic unit regularly.					
5. Regularly attended university faculty meetings.					
6. Prepared and submitted annual reports and other work for the academic unit on time.					
7. Actively participated in projects and initiatives related to the development of the collections and their integration into the curriculum by reviewing course catalogs and/or curriculum matrices within the required timeframe.					
8. Fulfilled commitments made while coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects.					
9. Participated in the development of co-curricular activities (Community Engagement, Volunteering, Center for Professional and International Experiences, Library, Language Lab, Neeuko, Academic Advising, or other institutional activities or projects).					
Maximum achievable score					

Total:	
Percentage:	

Comments:

Signature of the dean or his/her representative Date	
Signature of the evaluated professor Date	

> **Instructions:** Use the following rubric to complete Appendix A of the Evaluation and Promotion Manual .

Statement | The librarian...	Outstanding Performance 3	Expected Performance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1. Provides effective mechanisms for developing information literacy skills by offering workshops related to the academic curriculum		The assigned workshops were offered 95–100% of the time.	Delivered the majority (80–94%) of the time, the assigned workshops were offered.	Rarely (79% or fewer) did they offer the assigned workshops.	
2. Applied new technologies and strategies that promote the use of library resources and services within the academic community		Implemented new technologies and strategies that promote the use of library resources and services .		Did not implement new technologies and strategies that promote the use of library resources and services.	

Premise | The librarian...	Distinctive compliance 3	Expected performance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
3. Effectively responds to information and research inquiries from the entire academic community during working hours		Between 95–100% of the time, effectively addressed information and research inquiries from the entire academic community during working hours	Between 80–94% of the time, effectively addressed information and research inquiries from the entire academic community during working hours working hours	Between 0% and 79% % of the time, they effectively addressed information and research inquiries from the entire academic community during their hours of service	
4. Regularly attended faculty meetings in their academic unit		90–100% of the time, attended the meetings	Between 80–89% of the time, he/she attended the meetings	79% or fewer of the time, he/she did not attend the meetings	
5. Regularly attended university faculty meetings		90–100% of the time, he attended meetings	Between 80–89% of the time, he attended the meetings	79% or fewer of the time, he did not attend the meetings	

Premise | The professor	Distinctive achievement 3	Expected level of compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet expectations 0	Not applicable
6.Prepared and submitted annual reports and other assignments for the academic unit on time		90–100% of the time, the academic unit prepared and submitted annual reports and other work on time	Between 80–89% of the time, the academic unit prepared and submitted annual reports and other work on time	79% or fewer of the time, the academic unit prepared and submitted annual reports and other work on time	

Premise | The professor	Distinctive achievement 3	Expected level of compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet expectations 0	Not applicable
7.Actively participated in projects and initiatives related to the development of the collections and their integration into the curriculum by reviewing course syllabi and/or curriculum matrices within the required timeframe		He actively participated in all assigned projects or initiatives related to the development of the collections and their integration into the curriculum.		Did not actively participate in any projects or initiatives related to the development of the collections and their integration into the curriculum	

Premise | The professor	Level of Compliance 3	Expected level of compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet expectations 0	Not applicable
8.Met the commitments made when coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects	Exceeded (more than 100%) the work objectives set when coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects	Met (95–100%) the agreed-upon work objectives when coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects	Met (85–94%) of the agreed-upon work objectives when coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects	Did not meet the agreed-upon work objectives when coordinating and/or evaluating proposals and other institutional projects	Did not coordinate or evaluate proposals or other educational projects.
9.Participated in the development of co-curricular activities (Community Engagement, Volunteer Programs, Center for Professional and International Experiences, Library, Language Lab, Neeuko, Academic Advising, or	Participated in at least one (1)co-curricular initiative in two (2) workshops, and served as a resource on at least one occasion for a co-curricular project (including participating as a resource	Included at least one (1)co-curricular initiative in two (2) workshops, but did not serve as a resource	Included at least one (1) co-curricular initiative in one (1) course, but did not serve as a resource	Did not participated in the development of co-curricular activities	
(other institutional activity or project)	invited to give a talk, training session, or lecture, or to develop some content				

1 To earn the maximum score on criteria #3 and #4, the faculty member must have attended between 90% and 100% of the meetings convened by the President’s Office, the VPAA, or the dean of the academic unit, as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook. Excused absences will count as attendance up to 25% of the total number of meetings, except in exceptional cases in

which the committee will use its best judgment	

APPENDIX B1

Classroom Observation Form for Evaluating Teaching Performance

The purpose of this form is to evaluate teaching performance in the classroom. Members of the Classroom Observation Committee will complete it separately; then, after discussing their respective evaluations, they will fill out this form jointly by averaging the scores for each criterion and summarizing the comments. This summary will be the one discussed with the faculty member being evaluated. This instrument will also be used to evaluate candidates from academic units for promotion in rank within the teaching category.

> **Instructions:** Carefully read each criterion and, using the rubric provided in the appendix, select the option that best

represents your response using the following scale:

- Outstanding Achievement (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected performance level.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Did Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Statements enclosed in a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to “Met Expectations” (2 points) for that statement.

Name of the evaluated professor	

Academic Unit	
Members of the Classroom Observation Committee	
Section, format, day, and schedule of the course visited	
Type of visit	Classroom visit (for PF and HF courses) Zoom recording (for HV and VC courses) Zoom link:
Materials provided by the evaluated professor following the visit	Presentation or material discussed in the observed class Worksheets or student exercises used in the observed class Course curriculum or syllabus Other:

Assumptions	Yes	No
The professor:		
1. Treated the students with respect.		
2. Encouraged students to ask questions.		
3. Adhered to the institution's established class schedule, according to the format and/or made up the material in case of absence.		

Comments:

Premise | The professor...	Compliance Level 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1. Demonstrated mastery of the material discussed.					
2. Communicated clearly.					
3. Outlined the objectives or purposes of the class.					
4. Used a lesson structure that facilitated the achievement of the lesson's objectives. For example: introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and wrap-up.					
5. He or she used appropriate teaching strategies to meet the class objectives. For example, role-playing, discussion of readings, forums, case studies, slide presentations, debates, among others.					
6. Promoted active learning.					
7. Promoted critical thinking and creativity.					
8. Provided examples that facilitated understanding of the content discussed.					
Maximum possible score	22				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Additional details on teaching performance:

1. Indicate the topic, activity(ies), and structure of the class.

2. Indicate the Professor's strengths or most outstanding qualities.

3. Please indicate the professor areas for improvement and professional development.
4. What recommendations do you have for the professor?

Comments from the after discussing the evaluation:

professor

Signatures of the Classroom Observation Committee:

Signature of the principal or their representative Date	
Signature of the visiting Date	
professor	
Signature of the evaluated professor Date	

> **Instructions:** Use the following rubric to complete Appendices B1 and B2 of the Evaluation and Promotion Manual

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet expecta tions 0
1.Demonstrated mastery of the material discussed.	Mastered all of the material discussed and incorporated additional information on the topic to supplement it.	Mastered all of the material discussed, but did not incorporate additional information to supplement it.	Demonstrated mastery of most of the material.	Demonstrated mastery of some or none of the material.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet expecta tions 0
2.Communicated clearly.	90–100% of the time, the student used language convenient for the student population and used two (2) or more alternative forms of communication that promoted accessibility to the content. For example: used verbal, visual, audiovisual, and written communication, tailored to the number of people (recipients), among others.	80–89% of the time, the professor used language that was convenient for the student population and employed one (1) alternative form of communication that promoted accessibility to the content. For example: used verbal, visual, audiovisual, and written communication, tailored to the number of people (recipients), among others.	79% or fewer of the time, the professor used a language level convenient for the student population and used one (1) alternative form of communication that promoted accessibility to the content. For example: used verbal, visual, audiovisual, and written communication, tailored to the number of people (recipients), among	• Did not use a language level convenient for the student population; and • Did not use alternative forms of communication that promoted accessibility to the content.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
			Other.	
3. Explained the objectives or purposes of the class at the beginning of the evaluated session.		Explained the objectives or purposes of the class.	Implicitly explained the objectives or purposes of the class.	Did not explain the objectives or purposes of the class.
4. He or she used a class structure that facilitated the achievement of the class objectives. For example: introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and wrap- up.		The class structure was appropriate for meeting the class objectives or goals.	The class structure incorporated some organizational elements to meet the class's objectives or goals.	The class structure was inappropriate.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
5. Appropriate pedagogical strategy(ies) were used to meet the class objectives. For example, role- playing, discussion of readings, forums, case studies, slide presentations, debates, among others.	Used appropriate and innovative pedagogical strategies to meet the class objectives. Examples of innovative strategies: visits to industry sites, organizations, or communities; linked the course to industry, organizations, or communities; created or implemented	The pedagogical strategy(ies) used were appropriate for meeting the course objectives.	Some of the pedagogical strategies used were appropriate for meeting the course objectives.	The pedagogical strategies you used were not appropriate for meeting the course objectives.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive fulfillment 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
	interdisciplinary interdisciplinary projects in the course.			
6. Promoted active learning.	90–100% of the class was designed to have students actively engage with what they had learned.	Most of the class (80– 89%) was designed to have students actively engage with what they had learned.	There were few moments (79% or less of the class) dedicated to having students actively work on what they had learned.	There was no time for students to actively engage with what they had learned.
7. It promoted critical thinking and creativity.	Always (90–100%) of the class provided opportunities for reflection, analysis, and creativity.	Most of the time (80–89%) the class provided opportunities for reflection, analysis, and creativity.	There were few opportunities (79% or less) for reflection, analysis, and creativity.	There was no opportunity for reflection, analysis, or creativity.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive fulfillment 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
8. The professor provided examples that facilitated understanding of the content discussed.	Presented examples using innovative methods appropriate to the material being taught. For example: the integration of simulations or technology, infographics related to the topic discussed, videos, testimonials, real-life cases, and others.	The professor presented examples appropriate to the material being taught.	The professor presented examples, but they were not appropriate or were not related to the content being taught.	Did not use examples that facilitated understanding of the material taught.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
Maximum possible score	22			

APPENDIX B2

Summary of Classroom Visits to Evaluate Teaching Performance

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the professor's performance in the classroom. The academic unit's Promotion Committee will complete this summary, calculate the average for each criterion from the two Appendix B1 forms (Classroom Observation Form for Evaluating Teaching Performance) for the professor being evaluated, and copy the results onto this summary. If the faculty member being evaluated has more than two forms, they will select the two to submit to the Committee.

> **Instructions:** Carefully read each criterion and, using the rubric accompanying the

appendix, select the option that best represents your response using the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used for this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Statements enclosed in a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to "Met expectations" (2 points) for that statement.

Name of the evaluated professor	
Academic Unit	
Members of the Classroom Observation Committee	
Section, format, day, and schedule of the course visited	

Type of visit	Classroom visit (for PF and HF courses) Zoom recording (for HV and VC courses) Zoom link:
Materials provided by the evaluated professor following the visit	Presentation or material discussed in the observed class Worksheets or student exercises used in the observed class Course curriculum or syllabus Other:

Assumptions	Yes	No
The professor:		
1.Treated the students with respect.		
2.Encouraged students to ask questions.		
3.Adhered to the institution's established class schedule, according to the format, and/or provided make-up material in case of absence.		

Comments:

Premise | The professor...	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected performance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1.Demonstrated mastery of the material discussed.					
2.Communicated clearly.					
3.Outlined the objectives or purposes of the class.					
4.Used a lesson structure that facilitated the achievement of the lesson's objectives. For example: introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and wrap-up.					
5.Used appropriate teaching strategies to meet the class objectives. For example, role-playing, discussion of readings, forums, case studies for					

Premise | The professor...	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Performance 2	Partial fulfillment 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
study, slide presentations, discussions, among others.					
6.Promoted active learning.					
7.Promoted critical thinking and creativity.					
8.Provided examples that facilitated understanding of the content discussed.					
Maximum possible score	22				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Additional details on teaching performance:

1. Indicate the topic, activity(ies), and structure of the class.

2. Indicate the strengths or most outstanding qualities. professor

3. Please indicate the professor's areas for improvement and development. 4. What recommendations do you have for the professor?

Comments from the professor following the discussion of the evaluation.

Signatures of the Classroom Visit Committee:

Signature of the principal or his or her representative Date	
Signature of the visiting professor Date	
Signature of the evaluated professor Date	

APPENDIX C1

Faculty: Student

Evaluation of Teaching Performance

> **Instructions for Students:** Read and answer each statement using the corresponding scale.

If necessary, include your comments.

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently exceeded expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Performance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Items with a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to “Expected Compliance” (2 points) for that item.

Statement	Yes	No
The professor:		
1.Discussed the course handbook, syllabus, or curriculum matrix during the first week of classes.		
2.Provided clear instructions for all activities or assignments that were to be completed.		
3.Graded all my assignments or exams within two weeks of submission.		
4.Stuck to the established schedule and format, or made up the material when they were absent.		
5.Always replied to my emails within 72 hours.		
6.Was available to meet with me during in-person or virtual office hours.		
7.Would you recommend this professor to other students?		

Comments:

Premise | The professor…	Compliance Level 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1. Demonstrated mastery of the content. For example, by demonstrating an understanding of the topics discussed in class, being able to answer questions or address concerns about the topic discussed or presented, and displaying confidence when presenting the material, among other things.					
2. Encouraged student participation in the course. For example, by asking students to share their ideas, reflections, and concerns during class, dividing the class into small groups so that students could engage in a learning activity, providing opportunities for students to give short presentations, and listening to and considering students' suggestions for improving teaching and learning, among other things.					
3. He or she fostered students' critical thinking and creativity in the course by encouraging activities or assignments designed to encourage reflection, analysis, interpretation, or argumentation.					
4. Provided examples that helped students understand the material presented.					
5. Provided opportunities to clarify doubts.					

Premise | The professor…	Compliance Level 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
6. Treated students with respect. For example, by choosing words carefully, being punctual, communicating respectfully (both verbally and in writing), and consistently following through on class assignments and activities, among other things.					
7. Demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity. For example, by using inclusive language, assigning diverse readings, providing materials on Canvas, participating in related activities such as Gender Awareness Day and Violet Day, among others, and promoting the analysis of issues affecting minorities, among others.					
8. Handled any challenges that may have arisen during the course with professionalism. By					

Premise | The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Level of Compliance 2	Partial fulfillment 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
For example, connectivity issues, students in crisis, students with behavioral problems in the classroom, among others.					
Maximum possible score	18				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Comments:

In this section, you can share more information with us about your learning experience with this professor.

1. What did you like most about your experience in this course?

2. What recommendations do you have to improve the learning experience in this course?

APPENDIX C1

Librarian Student

Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Instructions for Students: Read and answer each statement using the corresponding scale. If necessary, include your comments.

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Met Expectations (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Performance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Items with a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to “Expected Compliance” (2 points) for that item.

Statement	Yes	No
The professor:		
1. Discussed the workshop objectives in a clear and organized manner.		
2. Managed the workshop’s time effectively.		
3. Used materials (printed, audiovisual, electronic, and/or other)		
4. Demonstrated mastery of the subject and kept me engaged.		
5. Made the activity relevant and helpful for the course I’m taking.		
6. Would you recommend the librarian who led the workshop to other students?		

Comments:

Premise | The professor…	Distinctive achievement 3	Expected performance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
1. Demonstrated mastery of the content.					

Premise | The professor…	Distinctive achievement 3	Expected performance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
2. Encouraged participation among workshop participants.					
3. Fostered critical thinking and creativity among workshop participants by encouraging activities or tasks designed to prompt reflection, analysis, interpret, or argue.					
4. Provided examples that made it easier to understand the content presented.					
5. Provided an opportunity to clarify questions.					
6. Treated the participants with respect. For example, by choosing words carefully, being punctual, and communicating respectfully (both spoken and written), and consistently following through on workshop tasks and activities, among other things.					
7. Demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity. For example, used inclusive language and diverse materials/ readings.					
8. Handled challenges (technological, behavioral, communication-related, etc.) that might arise during the workshop with professionalism. For example: connectivity issues, participants in crisis, or those with behavioral issues in the classroom.					
Maximum possible score	18				

Total:

Percentage:

Comments:

In this section, you can share more information with us about your learning experience with this professor.

1. What did you like most about your experience in this workshop?

2. What recommendations do you have to improve the learning experience in this course?

> **Instructions for Students:** Use the following rubric to complete your evaluation of your professor.

> **Instructions for the committee:** Use the following rubric to complete Appendix C2 of the Evaluation and Promotion

Manual.

Premise | The professor	Outstanding Performance 3	Expected Performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
1. Demonstrated mastery of the content.		Demonstrated mastery of all the material taught in the workshop.	Demonstrated mastery of part of the material taught in the workshop.	Showed little mastery of the material taught in the workshop.
2. Encouraged student participation in the course.	Throughout the workshop, they always (90–100%) encouraged participants' participation in the workshop.	Throughout the workshop, most of the time (80–89% of the time), he or she encouraged participation by the participants.	During the workshop, the facilitator encouraged participant engagement on some occasions (79% or fewer of the time).	He/she did not encourage participant engagement.
3. He or she encouraged critical thinking and creativity among workshop participants by promoting activities or tasks designed to prompt reflection, analysis, interpretation, or argumentation.	Throughout the workshop, the facilitator always (90–100% of the time) encouraged critical thinking and creativity among the participants.	Throughout the workshop, most of the time (80–89% of the time), it encouraged critical thinking and creativity among the participants.	Throughout the workshop, sometimes (79% or less of the time) did he/she encourage critical thinking and creativity among the participants?	It did not foster critical thinking or creativity among the participants.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet expect ations 0
4.Provided examples that helped participants understand the material presented.		Provided examples during the workshop that helped participants understand the material presented.		Did not provide examples that helped participants understand the content presented .
5.Provided opportunities for participants to ask questions.		He/she always (90– 100% of the time) provided opportunities for participants to ask questions at various points during the workshop.	Most of the time (80–89% of the time), they provided an opportunity for participants to ask questions during the workshop.	Sometimes or never (79% or fewer of the time) did the facilitator provide an opportunity for participants to ask questions during the workshop.
6. Treated the participants with respect. For example: using appropriate language, being punctual, expressing themselves respectfully, and consistently leading workshop activities, among other things.		Throughout the workshop, the facilitator treated participants with respect.		Throughout the workshop, the professor did not treat participants with respect.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet the criteri a 0
7. Demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity. For example, used inclusive language and diverse materials/readings.		Consistently (90–100% of the time) demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity.	On few occasions (89% or fewer of the time) did it demonstrate and promote inclusion and diversity.	Did not demonstrate a commitment to promoting inclusion and diversity.
8. Handled challenges (technological, behavioral, communication- related, etc.) that might arise during the workshop professionally. For example: connectivity issues, participants in crisis or with behavioral issues in the room.		Handled challenges that might have arisen during the workshop professionally, in accordance with institutional values.		Never handled challenges that might have arisen during the workshop professionally in accordance with institutional values.
Maximum achievable score	18			

Instructions for students: Use the following rubric to complete the evaluation of your professor.

Instructions for the committee: Use the following rubric to complete Appendix C2 of the Evaluation and Promotion

Manual.

Premise | The professor	Outstanding performance 3	Expected Performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet requirements 0
1. Demonstrated mastery of the content. For example, by demonstrating an understanding of the topics discussed in class, being able to answer questions or address concerns about the topic discussed or presented, and showing confidence when presenting the material, among other things.		Demonstrated mastery of all the material taught in the course.	Demonstrated mastery of part of the material taught in the course.	Showed little mastery of the material taught in the course.
2. Encouraged student participation in the course. For example, by asking students to share their ideas, reflections, and concerns during	Throughout the course, they consistently (90–100% of the time) encouraged student participation in the course.	Throughout the course, most of the time (80–89% of the time), they encouraged student participation.	Throughout the course, the professor encouraged student participation on some occasions (79% or fewer of the time).	Did not encourage student participation.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet expecta tions 0
classes, dividing the class into subgroups so that students could engage in a learning activity, giving students the opportunity to give short presentations, listening to and considering students' suggestions for improving teaching and learning, among others.				

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet expecta tions 0
3.Promoted students' critical thinking and creativity in the course by encouraging activities or assignments designed to reflect, analyze, interpret, or argue.	Throughout the class, the professor always (90–100% of the time) promoted critical thinking among the students.	Throughout the class, most of the time (80–89% of the time), the professor fostered critical thinking among students.	During the class, the professor sometimes (79% or fewer of the time) encouraged critical thinking among the students.	The professor did not encourage critical thinking among the students.
4.The professor provided examples that helped students understand the presented content.		He or she provided examples in class that helped students understand the presented.		Did not provide examples that helped students understand the content

Premise | The professor	Standout performance 3	Expected performance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0
				presented.
5.Provided opportunities for students to ask questions.		Always (90–100% of the time) provided opportunities for students to ask questions at various points throughout the course.	Most of the time (80–89% of the time), the professor provided opportunities for students to ask questions during the course.	Sometimes or never (79% or fewer of the time) did the professor provide opportunities for students to ask questions during the course.
6.Treated students with respect. For example: using appropriate language, being punctual, expressing oneself respectfully, and consistently completing class activities and assignments , among other things.		Throughout the course, treated students with respect.		Throughout the course, the professor did not treat students with respect.
7.Demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity. For example: using inclusive language, assigning diverse readings, providing inclusive materials on CANVAS, and participating in related activities such as Gender Awareness Day,		Consistently (90–100% of the time), they demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity.	On rare occasions (89% or fewer of the time), they demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity.	Did not demonstrate inclusion and diversity.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet expecta tions 0
Violeta Day, among others, promoting the discussion of issues affecting minorities, among other things.				
8.Handled challenges (technological, behavioral, communication-related, etc.) that might arise during the course with professionalism. For example: connectivity issues, a student in crisis, students with behavioral problems in the classroom.		Handled challenges that might have arisen during the course professionally, in accordance with institutional values.		Never handled the challenges that might have arisen during the course professionally in accordance with institutional values.
Maximum achievable score	18			

APPENDIX C2

Faculty

Summary of student evaluations of teaching performance

Professor's Name	
Academic Unit	
Names of the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee	
Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to gather student feedback on the professor's performance in the classroom. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee, which must calculate the average score for each statement from the three student evaluations submitted to the Committee by the professor and record them on this form.

Part I. Check the appropriate box for each statement according to the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Items with a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to "Expected Compliance" (2 points) for that item.

Statement	Yes	No
The professor:		
1.Discussed the course handbook, syllabus, or curriculum matrix during the first week of class.		
2.Provided clear instructions for all activities or assignments that were to be completed.		
Premises	Yes	No
3. Graded all my assignments or exams within no more than two weeks after they were turned in.		
4. Adhered to the established schedule and format, or made up the material when absent.		

5. Always replied to my emails within 72 hours.		
6. Was available to assist me during in-person or virtual office hours.		
7. Would you recommend this professor to other students?		

Premise | The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
1. Demonstrated mastery of the content. For example, by demonstrating an understanding of the topics discussed in class, being able to answer questions or address concerns about the topic discussed or presented, and showing confidence when presenting the material, among others.					
2. Promoted student participation in the course. For example, by asking students to share their ideas, reflections, and concerns during class, dividing the class into small groups so that students could engage in a learning activity, providing opportunities for students to give short presentations, and listening to and considering students' suggestions for improving teaching and learning, among other things.					
3. He or she fostered students' critical thinking and creativity in the course by encouraging activities or assignments designed to prompt reflection, analysis, interpretation, or argue.					
4. Provided examples that made it easier to understand the material presented.					
5. Provided opportunities to clarify questions.					

Premise | The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
6. Treated students with respect. For example, by choosing words carefully, being punctual, communicating respectfully (both verbally and in writing), and consistently following through on assignments and class activities, among other things.					
7. Demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity. For example, by using inclusive language, diverse readings,					

Premise | The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Performance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not comply 0	Not applicable
materials included in Canvas, participating in related activities such as Gender Awareness Day and Violet Day, among others, and promoting the analysis of issues affecting minorities, among other things.					
8. Handled any challenges that may have arisen during the course with professionalism. For example, connectivity issues, students in crisis, students with behavioral problems in the classroom, among others.					
Maximum achievable score	18				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Signature of the professor: Date:

APPENDIX C2

Librarian

Summary of student evaluations of teaching performance

Professor's Name	
Academic Unit	
Names of the Members of the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee	
Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to gather student feedback on the professor's performance in the classroom. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee, which must calculate the average for each statement from the three student evaluations submitted to the Committee by the professor and record them on this form.

Part I. Check the appropriate box for each statement according to the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Items with a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to "Expected Compliance" (2 points) for that item.

Statement	Yes	No
The professor:		
1.Discussed the workshop objectives in a clear and organized manner.		
2.Managed the workshop's time effectively.		
3.Used materials (printed, audiovisual, electronic, and/or other)		
4.Demonstrated mastery of the subject and kept the audience engaged.		
5.Made the activity relevant and helpful for the course I am taking.		

6.Would you recommend the librarian who led the workshop to other students?		

Premise | The professor…	Compliance or Distinction 3	Expected Expected 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
1.Demonstrated mastery of the material.					
2.Encouraged workshop participants in the workshop.					
3.Fostered critical thinking and creativity among workshop participants by encouraging activities or tasks designed to reflect, analyze, interpret, or argue.					
4.Provided examples that made it easier to understand the material presented.					
5.Provided an opportunity to clarify questions.					
6.Treated the participants with respect. For example, by choosing their words carefully, being punctual, communicating respectfully (both spoken and written), and consistently following through on workshop tasks and activities, among other things.					
7.Demonstrated and promoted inclusion and diversity. For example, by using inclusive language and diverse materials and readings.					

Premise | The professor…	Compliance or Distinction 3	Expected Expected 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
8.Handled challenges (technological, behavioral, communication-related, etc.) that might arise during the workshop professionally. For example: connectivity issues, participants in crisis, or those exhibiting behavioral problems in the classroom.					
Maximum possible score	18				

Total:	

Percentage:	

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Signature of the professor: Date:

APPENDIX D

Teaching Evaluation Form for Promotion Requirements

Name of the professor	
Academic unit	
Names of the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee	
Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to determine whether the faculty member qualifies as a candidate for promotion. To qualify, the faculty member must achieve an overall average of 2 "Expected Performance" ratings on this form. If so, the faculty member will proceed to the promotion evaluation.

This form will be completed by the members of the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee based on the information obtained in Appendices A, B2, and C2 of the Evaluation and Rank Promotion Manual.

The relative weight of the teaching category, depending on the rank sought, will be: Assistant Professor 75%, Associate Professor 70%, Professor 65%

Check the appropriate box for each statement according to the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does not meet standards (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not applicable – This category of the scale is not used for this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be included when calculating the average.

Note: Statements with a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to "Expected Compliance" (2 points) for that statement.

Please enter below the average obtained on the corresponding sheets for each of the

following criteria:

From Appendix A

The professor…	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
1. Taught classes with the regularity required by the format of each course.					
2. Was available to students during office hours or by appointment.					
3. Regularly attended faculty meetings for their academic unit.					
4. Regularly attended university faculty meetings.					
5. Submitted the course evaluation, the enrollment roster for the first two weeks, and grades (midterms and finals) on time.					
6. Created, reviewed, and/or updated the curriculum, courses, and/or course syllabi by the dates specified by the dean or director.					
7. Fulfilled the commitments made upon accepting teaching reductions or leaves of absence, and coordinated and/or evaluated proposals and other institutional projects.					
8. Participated in the development of co-curricular activities (Community Engagement, Volunteering, Center for Professional and International Experiences, Library, Language Lab, Neeuko, Academic Advising, or other institutional activities or projects).					

Maximum achievable score	19

Total:	

Average:	

From Appendix B2

The professor…	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
1.Demonstrated mastery of the discussed content.					
2.Communicated clearly.					
3.Outlined the objectives or purposes of the class.					
4.Used a lesson structure that facilitated the achievement of the lesson's objectives. For example: introduction to the topic, discussion, practice, and conclusion.					
5.Used appropriate teaching strategies to meet the class objectives.					
6.He or she promoted active learning.					
7.Promoted critical thinking and creativity.					
8.Provided examples that facilitated understanding of the content discussed.					
Maximum possible score	22				

Total:	
Average:	

From Appendix C2

The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected level of compliance 2	Partial fulfillment 1	Did not meet the requirement 0	Not applicable
1.Demonstrated mastery of the content.					
2.Encouraged student participation.					
3.Encouraged critical thinking and creativity among students.					

The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected level of compliance 2	Partial fulfillment 1	Did not meet the requirement 0	Not applicable
4.Provided examples that made it easier to understand the material presented.					
5.Provided an opportunity to clarify questions.					
6.Treated students with respect.					
7.Promoted inclusion and diversity.					
8.Handled any challenges that might arise during the course with professionalism.					
Maximum possible score	18				

Total:	
Average:	

To calculate the final average, add the three averages (A, B2, and C2) and divide by three (3).

Final average:	

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Professor's signature: Date:

APPENDIX E

Teaching Category Evaluation

Name of the professor	
Academic Unit	
Names of the Members of the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee	
Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate’s performance in the teaching category. It will be completed by the Academic Unit’s Promotion Committee based on the percentages obtained in Appendices A, B2, and C2.

(A x .30) + (B2 x 0.35) + (C2 x 0.35) =

Total:

This result is entered in the “teaching” column corresponding to the rank being evaluated in Appendix I.

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Signature of the professor: Date:

Process for Calculating the Percentage Obtained for Promotion in Rank

To calculate the percentage obtained for promotion in rank, follow these steps:

1. First, determine the percentage for each evaluation: the administrative evaluation (Appendix A), the peer evaluation (Appendix B2), and the student evaluation (Appendix C2). To do this, add up the scores obtained for all criteria that have points assigned. Then, divide that total by the maximum possible score for the evaluation in question. The result will be a decimal number that you will multiply by 100. Repeat this step for each of the three evaluations. 2. Next, in Appendix E, apply the weight assigned to each evaluation, which is as follows: administrative evaluation .30 (Appendix A), peer evaluation .35 (Appendix B2), and student evaluation .35 (Appendix C2). To do this, multiply the percentage obtained in the evaluation by .30 or .35, depending on the evaluation being calculated. The result of this multiplication will be a whole number with a decimal, which is the weighted percentage for that evaluation. Repeat this step for each of the three evaluations, applying the corresponding weight in the multiplication. 3. Next, record the weighted percentage obtained for each evaluation in the respective boxes. That is: administrative evaluation (Appendix A), peer evaluation (Appendix B2), and student evaluation (Appendix C2). 4. Add the three weighted percentages together. The result of this sum will be the total percentage ob-

tained by the professor in their evaluation for promotion in rank within the teaching category.

APPENDIX F1

Evaluation of the research component for the research and/or creative

category

Professor's Name	
Academic unit	
Names of the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee	
Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion in the research component of the research and/or creative category. It will be completed by the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee based on Appendix J and other documents submitted by the candidate, such as copies of research projects, articles, and any other evidence deemed necessary.

In this category, 70% of the weight is assigned to the completion of the research project and 30% to the dissemination of results. The final percentage from this evaluation will form part of the cumulative score for the different categories evaluated: teaching, research, and/or creative work. Depending on the rank sought, it will be:

5% Assistant Professor 10% Associate Professor 15% Full Professor

2 Research: In the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46.102(d)) regarding the protection of human subjects, research is defined as "a systematic inquiry (e.g., collection and analysis of information) designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge." To this end, a rigorous methodology is employed, which may be quantitative or qualitative in nature. The National Academy of Sciences states that the goal of research is "to extend human knowledge about the physical, biological, or social world beyond what is already known." Research differs from other forms of knowledge discovery (such as reading a book) because it uses a systematic process called the scientific method. Select the score that best describes the professor's performance during the evaluation period

in terms of:

A. Development of research projects (70%):

- Does not meet requirements—Did not provide evidence of having conducted any research projects.
- Partial Compliance (1) - Option #1: Submitted evidence of having prepared a research proposal, but no evidence of having implemented and completed the re-

search. Option #2: Collected data, but did not submit evidence of having analyzed it.

- Expected Compliance (2) - Option #1: Provided evidence of having conducted one small- scale research project[3] or provided evidence of having prepared two small-scale research proposals and having completed at least one (1) of the projects. Option #2: Provided evidence of having one (1) large-scale research project currently in progress.
- Distinctive Compliance (3) - Alternative #1: Submitted evidence that they conducted two (2) small-scale research projects. Alternative #2: Submitted evidence that they conducted at least one (1) large-scale research project. [4]

Scoring:

B. Dissemination of Results (30%):

- Does not meet the requirement (0) - Did not provide evidence that they disseminated the results of the research project.
- Partial compliance (1) – Submitted evidence that they disseminated the results of the research project by providing copies of the research to a library.
- Expected compliance (2) - Option #1: Submitted evidence that they disseminated the results of the research project by providing copies to a library and giving a talk at their academic unit. Option #2: Submitted evidence that they disseminated the results of the research project by providing copies of the research to a library, delivering a lecture, and publishing an article or review in newspapers or other print or electronic publications.
- Distinctive Compliance (3) - Provided evidence of disseminating the results of the research project by providing copies of the research to a library, delivering a lecture, and publishing an article in a peer-reviewed professional journal, in a book, in a widely circulated newspaper, or via electronic media.

Score:

3 Examples of smaller-scale research: research for newspaper articles, lectures, literary or bibliographic reviews, and proposals, among others. Examples of larger-scale research: research for theses, books, essays for specialized or peer-reviewed journals, institutional projects, among others. Enter the scores obtained for project development and dissemination of results in the corresponding spaces. Perform the indicated calculation and enter the resulting value in the box.

Project Development Dissemination Total Value (.70 ×) + (.30x) =

Enter that value in the research and/or creation box corresponding to the rank being evaluated in Appendix I. 5

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Professor's Signature: Date:

5 If the professor submits evidence of research and creative work, the scores obtained in Appendices F1 and F2 are added together, up to a maximum of 3.

APPENDIX F2

Evaluation of the creative work component[6] for the research and/or creative work

category

Professor's Name	
Academic unit	
Names of the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee	
Date of evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion in rank in the area of research and/or creative work. It will be completed by the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee based on Appendix J and other documents submitted by the professor, such as copies of creative projects and any evidence deemed necessary.

In this category, 70% of the weight is assigned to the completion of the creative project and 30% to the dissemination of results. The final percentage from this evaluation will form part of the cumulative score for the various categories evaluated: teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and professional development. The relative weight of the research and/or creative work category, depending on the rank sought, will be:

5% Assistant Professor 10% Associate Professor 15% Full Professor Select the score that best describes the professor's performance during the evaluation period

in terms of:

A. Creative Project Development (70%):

- Failed (0) - Did not provide evidence of having completed any creative project.

6 Creativity is defined as the generation of a product of the imagination in any medium (video, multimedia, literature, visual arts, music, and theater) that involves research that contributes to teaching, human understanding, and reflection.

- Partial compliance (1) – Submitted evidence of having developed a proposal for a creative project.
- Expected Compliance (2) – Submitted evidence that a creative project is in progress.
- Outstanding Achievement (3) - Presented evidence that they completed at least one creative project.

Score:

B. Dissemination of the Creative Project7 (30%):

- Does not meet requirements (0) - Did not provide evidence of having publicized the creative project.
- Partial Compliance (1) - Provided evidence that they shared the creative project with the university community.
- Expected Compliance (2) - Provided evidence of having shared the creative project with a local in-person and/or virtual audience.
- Outstanding Compliance (3) - Provided evidence of having disseminated the creative project to an international audience, either in person and/or virtually.

Score:

Enter the scores obtained for project development and dissemination of results in the corresponding spaces. Perform the indicated calculation and enter the resulting value in the box.

Project Development Dissemination Total Score (.70 ×) + (.30x) =

Enter that value in the research and/or creation box corresponding to the rank being evaluated in Appendix I. 8

Instructor's Comments:

7 Exhibitions and stage productions (musical or theatrical) are forms of dissemination that qualify for this category. If the professor submits evidence of research and creative work, the scores obtained in Appendices F1 and F2 are added together, up to a maximum of 3.

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

's signature: Date:

Professor

APPENDIX G

Service Category Evaluation

Professor's Name	
Academic Unit	
Names of the members of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee	
Date of evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion in rank in the service category. It will be completed by the director of the academic unit based on Appendix J and other relevant documents contained in the evaluated professor's file.

The relative weight of the service category, depending on the rank sought, will be:

5% Assistant Professor 10% Associate Professor 15% Full Professor

> **Instructions:** Carefully read each statement and, using the rubric accompanying the

appendix, select the option that best represents your response using the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Met Expectations (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Performance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Statements enclosed in a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to "Expected Compliance" (2 points) for that statement.

The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
1. Actively participated in Academic Unit committees.					
2. Actively participated in institutional committees.					

The professor…	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial Compliance 1	Did not meet 0	Not applicable
3. Actively participated in retention activities for their program or academic unit. (For example: calls or messages to students, special events, working groups, among others.)					
4. Participated in the organization, development, and implementation of institutional activities and projects for the academic unit and the external community, such as: graduation, Night of Achievements, Open House, and other activities organized by the Office of the President or the VPAA.					
5. Carried out service activities for the academic unit. For example: coordinating departments, academic programs, courses, etc.					
6. Participated in professional activities and/or assisted in their organization.					
Maximum achievable score	17				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Comments from the director:

Comments from the professor:

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Professor's signature: Date:

> **Instructions:** Use the following rubric to complete Appendix G of the Evaluation and Promotion Manual.

Premise | The professor	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet expecta tions 0
1. Actively participated in Academic Unit committees.	• Made himself/ herself available, participated, and collaborated in two (2)committees or working groups of the Academic Unit on his/her own initiative. • If not elected to the selected committee, made themselves available to another .	Participated and contributed to two (2)assigned committees or working groups of the Academic Unit.	Participated and contributed to one (1) assigned committee or working group within the Academic Unit.	Did not participate in or contribute to any committees or working groups of the Academic Unit.
2. Actively participated in institutional committees.	∉ Made himself/ herself available, participated, and contributed to two (2)institutional committees. ∉ If not elected to the selected committee, made himself/herself available to	Participated and contributed to two (2)institutional committees.	Participated and contributed to one (1) institutional committee.	Did not participate in or contribute to any institutional committees.
	another institutional committee.			

Premise | The professor or the female professor	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0
3. Actively participated in retention activities for their program or academic unit. For example: calls or messages to students, special activities, working groups, among others).	Took the initiative to volunteer (90–100% of the time) or to develop retention activities for their program or academic unit.	Collaborated (80– 89% of the time) on the assigned retention initiatives of their program or academic unit.	Participated minimally (79% or fewer of the time) in the assigned retention initiatives of their program or academic unit.	Did not participate in the retention initiatives of their program or academic unit.
4. Participated in the organization, development, and implementation of institutional activities and projects for the academic unit and the external community, such as:		9 Actively participated (90–100% of the time) and volunteered to organize, develop, and achieve the goals of the activities and projects of their academic unit, the institution's, and	Participated on some occasions (80–89%) and volunteered on some occasions to organize, carry out, and achieve the goals of the activities and projects of their academic unit,	Did not participate or make themselves available to organize, carry out, and achieve the goals of the activities and projects of their academic unit, the institution, and

9 To earn the maximum score, the student must have attended between 90% and 100% of the activities organized by the Office of the President or the VPAA, as stipulated in the

Faculty Manual. Excused absences will count as attendance up to 25% of the total activities, except in exceptional cases in which the committee will exercise its discretion.

Prerequisite | The professor or the female professor	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0
Graduation, Night of Achievements, Open House, and other activities organized by the Office of the President or the VPAA.		from the external community	from the institution and the external community.	from the external community.
5. Carried out service activities for the academic unit. For example: coordination of departments, academic programs, courses, etc.	Carried out three (3) or more service activities for the academic unit.	Carried out two (2) service activities for the academic unit.	Carried out one (1) service activity for the academic unit.	Did not carry out any service activities for the academic unit.

Prerequisite | The professor or the female professor	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0
6. Participated in professional activities and/ or helped organize them.	Participated in three (3) or more professional activities and/or helped organize them.	∉ Participated in two (2) professional activities and/or helped organize them.	Participated in one (1) professional activity and/or helped organize it.	Did not participate in professional activities in their field of expertise nor assist in their organization.
Maximum possible score	17			

Total:	
Percentage:	

APPENDIX H

Professional Development Category Evaluation

Professor's Name	
Academic Unit	
Names of the Members of the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee	
Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the candidate's performance for promotion within the professional development category. The Academic Unit's Promotion Committee will complete this form based on the information contained in Appendix J and the supporting documentation submitted by the candidate. The relative weight of the professional

development category, depending on the rank sought, will be:

15% Assistant Professor 10% Associate Professor 5% Professor

> **Instructions:** Carefully read each statement and, using the rubric provided in the appendix,

select the option that best represents your response using the following scale:

- Outstanding Performance (3) – Consistently performed above expectations.
- Expected Performance (2) – Met the expected level of performance.
- Partial Compliance (1) – Partially met expectations. Needs to improve performance in some critical areas.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (0) – Did not meet expectations and needs to improve performance in critical areas.
- Not Applicable – This category of the scale is not used in this evaluation criterion. Criteria marked in this category should not be counted toward the percentage.

Note: Statements enclosed in a gray box indicate that the maximum achievable score corresponds to "Expected Compliance" (2 points) for that statement.

During the evaluation period, the professor:

The professor…	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet	Not applicable
1. Participated in professional associations.					

The professor…	Distinctive Compliance 3	Expected Compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet	Not applicable
2.Participated in academic activities, such as forums, conferences, seminars, workshops, and interdisciplinary collaborative work, among others. Participation may be as a guest, a speaker, or an attendee (no presentation required).					
3.Earned academic degrees, completed formal courses or continuing education courses, or obtained certificates.					
4.Served as a resource in professional activities (national or international).					
Maximum achievable score	12				

Total:	
Percentage:	

Comments from the academic unit's promotion committee:

Comments from the professor:

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Signature of the professor: Date:

> **Instructions:** Use the following rubric to complete Appendix H of the Evaluation and Promotion Manual.

Premise | The professor or the	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet 0
female 1. Participated in profespsrioonfaelssor associations.	Participated in two (2)or more of the following: a local or international association, in addition to actively participating in at least one (1) committee, board of directors, or working group of one of the associations.	Participated in two (2)of the following: a local or international association.	Participated in one (1)local or international association.	Did not participate in a professional association.
2.Participated in academic activities, such as forums, conferences, seminars, workshops, and interdisciplinary collaborative work, among others. Participation may be as a guest,	Coordinated one (1)academic activity and participated in one (1)or more academic activities (other than the one coordinated).	Participated in two (2) academic activities.	Participated in one (1) Academic activity.	Did not participate in any academic activities.

Premise | The professor or the female professor	Distinctive Achievement 3	Expected compliance 2	Partial compliance 1	Did not meet requirements 0
as a speaker or participant (no presentation).				
3. Completed academic degrees, formal courses, continuing education courses, or obtained certificates.	Completed three (3) or more of the following: academic degrees, formal courses, continuing education courses, obtained certificates, or completed professional development .	Completed two (2) of the following: academic degrees, formal courses, continuing education courses, obtained certificates, or completed professional development courses.	Completed one (1) of the following: an academic degree, a formal course, a continuing education course, obtained a certificate, or completed professional development courses.	Did not complete any of the following: academic degree, formal course, continuing education course, or obtained a certificate or completed professional development courses.
4. Served as a resource in professional activities (national or international).	Participated as a resource in three (3) or more professional activities.	Participated as a resource in two (2) professional activities.	Participated as a resource in one (1) professional activity.	Did not participate in any professional activities.
Maximum achievable score	12			

Total:	
Percentage:	

APPENDIX I

Calculation to determine the total percentages for each range

Professor's Name	

Academic unit
Names of the Members of the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee

Date of the evaluation	

The purpose of this form is to record the total percentages obtained by the candidate in each category according to the relative weights established for each category, based on the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. It will be completed by the Academic Unit's Rank Promotion Committee based on the totals obtained in Appendices E, F1 and/or F2, G, and H.

	Teaching	Research and/or Creative Work	Service	Professional Development	Total
Assistant	(.75 x)	+.05 x)	+.05 x)	+(.15 ×)	=
Member	(.70 ×)	+(.10 ×)	+(.10 ×)	+(.10 ×)	=
Professor	(.65 ×)	+(.15 ×)	+(.15 x)	+(.05 ×)	=
Total					=

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Professor's signature: Date:

APPENDIX J

Self-Evaluation Summary

The purpose of this form is for the candidate for promotion to present their key achievements in each of the four dimensions evaluated during the years covered by this evaluation. To do so, they will use the information contained in their annual reports, which must be supported by the necessary documentation.

Name of the professor	
Academic unit Academic	
background	
Years of service	

Current rank: Check (X) Years in this rank:

Instructor Assistant Professor Associate Professor

Key achievements during the evaluation period, 20

to 20

Teaching:

Research and/or creation:

Service:

Professional Development:

Administrative duties:

signature: Date:

Professor's

APPENDIX K

Summary of the Recommendation for Promotion in Rank

This form will be completed by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee with the scores obtained in Appendices E, F1 and/or F2, G, H, and I.

Name of the professor	
Academic Unit	
Academic Background	Doctorate Master's Degree
Current rank	
Desired Rank	

Summary of Teaching Category:

Score obtained:

Narrative summary:

Summary of the research and/or creative category:

Score obtained:

Narrative summary:

Summary of the professional development category:

Score obtained:

Narrative summary:

Summary of the service category:

Score obtained:

Narrative summary:

Percentage obtained in Appendix I:

Recommendation of the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee:

Signatures of the members of the evaluation committee:

Signature of the professor: Date:

APPENDIX L

Analysis of the Candidate for Promotion

Name of the professor Academic Unit	
Current Rank	
Date of Evaluation	

This form will be completed by the Institutional Promotion Committee using the information contained in Appendix K and any other documentation it deems necessary,

which must be identified in the corresponding sections:

Teaching:

Score assigned by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee:

Material reviewed by the Institutional Promotion Committee:

Research and/or Creative Work:

Score assigned by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee:

Material reviewed by the Institutional Promotion Committee:

Professional Development:

Score assigned by the Academic Unit's Promotion Committee:

Material reviewed by the Institutional Rank Promotion Committee:

Recommendations of the Institutional Promotion Committee:

Comments from the candidate:

Signatures of the Institutional Rank Promotion

Dates:

Committee:

I have read this evaluation and am fully aware of its contents.

Signature of the professor: Date:

Note on This English Version

This document is the English version of the *Manual de Evaluación y Ascenso en Rango* of Universidad del Sagrado Corazón, revised April 19, 2024.

The translation from Spanish into English was produced using **DeepL**. The formatting and layout of this English version were produced using **Claude**, an artificial intelligence assistant developed by Anthropic, which also carried out a terminology review of the translated text. Formatting work was limited to presentation — typography, page layout, heading hierarchy, tables, the cover page, and the table of contents.

The Spanish *Manual de Evaluación y Ascenso en Rango* remains the official document of record. In the event of any discrepancy between this English version and the Spanish original, the Spanish original governs.